Response and Amendment

Application No. 10/750,214

Filing Date: January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 Amdt, dated: August 24th, 2006

Reply to Office Action of: March 24th, 2006

Page 8

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 20 are pending in this application and in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7 were rejected as anticipated by US Patent 4176335 (to Charpentier) or obvious and unpatentable in view of the combined teachings of U.S. Patent No. 4,940,921 (to Helling et al) and Charpentier's '335 patent.

These rejections are believed to be traversed in view of the following remarks.

The structure of present invention, as positively recited in claim 1, includes essentially a single, unbranched conductive path through the inductor, and that path is through the primary coil's first and second terminals, where the secondary is insulated from that conductive path. The secondary is a closed loop configured to provide a path for eddy currents induced by magnetic flux.

Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part:

"...at least one primary coil formed of a continuous conductor having first and second terminal ends, each primary coil having a helical winding section wound around an interior space, said at least one primary coil capable of producing magnetic field lines, wherein the interior space is intersected by said primary coil magnetic field lines; and

at least one secondary closed loop formed of a continuous conductor and being electrically insulated from said primary coil..."

Claim 1 positively recites, therefore, that the primary coil and the secondary closed loop coil *are not electrically connected* to one another but are instead *electrically insulated* from one another, and that the secondary is a *closed loop*.

Response and Amendment

Application No. 10/750,214

Filing Date: January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 Amdt. dated: August 24th, 2006

Reply to Office Action of: March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Page 9

Charpentier's '335 patent, by way of contrast, shows what appears to be a primary coil 5 defined between terminals 5p and 7p, and a secondary coil 6 defined between terminals 6p and 7p, where terminal 7p makes an electrical connection between the primary and secondary coils. Charpentier's structure also includes conductive structures 13a and 13b, but neither defines a closed loop (best seen in Figs 1-3).

U.S. Patent No. 4,940,921 (to Helling et al) teaches a structure for a ballast having only terminated coils, not closed loops, and each of the terminated coils define a transformer winding where induced currents are made to flow through the terminals to do the work of starting a fluorescent lamp (see Figs 2-4 and 7a). Helling does not teach or suggest the damping benefits conferred by the structure of the present invention as recited in claim 1, and no combination of the teachings of '921 to Helling and Charpentier's structure can be derived which does not plainly destroy the operational characteristics each inventor sought to achieve with their invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1 and so are also patentably distinguishable over the art of record. In addition, new claims 8-20 also depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1 and so are also patentably distinguishable over the art of record. §112 support for the new claims is found in the specification, and for new claims 9 and 10, support is shown in the embodiment of Figs 12-14 and the description beginning on page 21.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is asked to consider entering this response and amendment and pass the application to allowance. Response and Amendment Application No. 10/750,214

Filing Date: January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 Amdt. dated: August 24th, 2006

Reply to Office Action of: March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Page 10

Further and favorable consideration is requested.

It is believed that a two month extension of time and fee are required, and that extension is petitioned for under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) with this filing. In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims or the additional of independent claims in excess of three) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 10-1213 and the undersigned is requested to be notified of any such charges.

Should the Examiner have any questions, she is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Andrew McKinney, Jr. Registration No. 34,672

Date: 8/24/06

MAILING ADDRESS: JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, PC Customer # 23294 2001 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Suite 1002 Arlington, VA 22202

Contact information:

Telephone: (703) 413-2553 Facsimile: (703) 415-1508